From: JOHN DURAND

309 Sugar Hill

Tolland, CT 860 871 6372 porchejd@yahoo.com

This is to **STRONGLY OBJECT** to wasting any monies STUDYING or promoting the re-installation of Tolls in CT.

- The Gov. and Legislature should be concentrating on one thing, reducing the Budget.
- 2. Tolls as a "new" revenue stream "to fix our infrastructure" is a lie we have been putting Fed. and Gas tax funds into the General Fund, paying for daily expenses and complaining there are no funds to fix the roads. Waterbury I84 is a disaster yet we waste what will end up being over a Billion \$.s on a useless Busway, plan to put all the monies we do spend in Fairfield County and REPAVE 84 and 91 over and over again, year after year. Some paving contractor is making a fortune using reground asphalt which fails after about 1 year, is not held liable for shoddy work/materials but is instead granted a new contract to repeat the same nonsense again.
- 3. This is nothing but an extension of the "INCREMENTALIST" approach to shoving new taxes down the throats of taxpayers. The proposal will be MARKETED as "only at the borders". Then if that gets passed, the next step will be to MARKET what a great success and that it should be expanded to this route that needs repair etc. etc.. A very good example of this incremental approach is the champagne to legalize "MEDICAL marijuana", needing a whole new (non-medical) production and distribution structure. Another LIE. If it was solely for MEDICAL, it could have been treated as any other pharm. / drug, produced by pharm.cos. and distributed via drug stores like any other prescription. The plan is really to legalize it period, just like alcohol.
- 4. Again, I stress that the cure for CT's budget problems is WASTE. Pure and simple. Big is not Better. Handouts for votes should be prosecuted by the AG, but wait, he represents the State also. I don't buy for a moment the arguments regards the electronic collection etc. Should the majority of CT taxpayers, not elected officials, chose to go the way of tolls (there should be a mandatory referendum), Then it should EXCLUDE CT residents and their CT registered vehicles.